

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 have been examined and have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

I. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

The Examiner has rejected claims 11 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. However, since claims 11 and 21 have been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer, Applicant submits that the rejection of such claims is now moot.

II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,240,183 to Marchant et al. (“Marchant”)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Marchant.

A. Claim 1

Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over the cited reference. For example, claim 1 recites registering a numerical calculation method that is designated by the user and being specific to the user as user authentication information.

The Examiner maintains that column 5, lines 55-62 and column 7, lines 6-13 of Marchant disclose the above features. In column 5, Marchant merely discloses the basic encryption and decryption of data. For example, when a user of computer 102 wishes to send secure

information, the data site 62 has access to a set of encryption algorithms 202 and an encryption schema 204 that are used to encrypt data (col. 5, lines 55-65 and col. 6, lines 51-53). Applicant submits that such encryption algorithms/schema do not teach or suggest a “numerical calculation” method that is registered to determine if a user is qualified to use a service and is specifically designated by the user, as recited in claim 1. Rather, the encryption is used when the user has already accessed a system and wants to send secure information. Also, encryption algorithms/schema are not considered “user authentication information,” as recited in claim 1. Rather, as set forth above, they just encrypt/decrypt data.

In the cited portion of column 7, Marchant discloses the use of a password. Although such password is presumably designated by the user, the password is not a “numerical calculation method.”

Claim 1 further recites transmitting an arbitrary numeric value from the service providing site through the network to the user. The user then obtains a first calculation result by using the arbitrary numeric value in the registered numerical calculation method.

The Examiner maintains that column 8, line 55 to column 9, line 9 of Marchant discloses the above features. However, the cited portion merely discloses that a memory 316 of a security unit 52 accesses bits for use in encryption and decryption, and an identifier is used to indicate which particular encryption algorithm will be used to encrypt a string. There is absolutely no teaching or suggestion that a numeric value is sent from a service providing site through a network to a user, as recited in claim 1. Further, there is no disclosure that a user using computer

102 uses such numeric value in a numerical calculation method to obtain a first calculation result. As set forth above, there is no numerical calculation method disclosed in Marchant, and certainly, there is no numerical calculation method used by the user to obtain a calculation result.

If the Examiner wishes to persist in the above rejection, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to specifically indicate which term or reference numeral, in Marchant, is alleged to disclose the claimed arbitrary numeric value, and further where it is disclosed that a “user” uses the arbitrary numeric value in a numerical calculation method to obtain a calculation result.

Claim 1 also recites transmitting the first calculation result from the user, through the network, to the service providing site, and it is determined whether the first calculation result equals a second calculation result which is obtained by the service providing site by applying the arbitrary numeric value to the registered numerical calculation method.

The Examiner maintains that column 6, lines 40-50 and column 8, lines 3-19 of Marchant disclose the above features. However, the cited portions merely disclose how the encryption takes place, i.e., a circular data block, and the use of a pin or public code register. The cited portions do not disclose that a *first calculation result* is transmitted by a user, where the first calculation result is obtained using a numerical calculation method which is designated by the user.

Based on the foregoing, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over the cited references. If the Examiner wishes to persist in the above rejection, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to more clearly define what features of Marchant are believed to disclose

the claimed numerical calculation method, the arbitrary numeric value, and further to show where a user obtains the first calculation result using the arbitrary numeric value and the numerical calculation method.

B. Claims 2, 3, 9, 10 and 11

Since independent claims 2, 3, 9 and 10 contain features that are analogous to the features recited in claim 1, Applicant submits that such claims are patentable for at least analogous reasons as presented above. Further, since claim 11 was canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer, Applicant submits that the rejection of such claim is now moot.

C. Claims 4-8 and 12-21

Since claims 4-8 and 12-20 are dependent upon one of claims 1, 2, 3, 9 and 10, Applicant submits that such claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency. In addition, since claim 21 has been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer, Applicant submits that the rejection of such claim is now moot.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application No.: 09/845,319

Attorney Docket No.: Q64335

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Allison M. Tulino
Registration No. 48,294

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: **April 27, 2006**